Legitimating global governance: Publicisation, affectedness, and the Committee on World Food Security

Brem-Wilson, J.

Author post-print (accepted) deposited by Coventry University's Repository

Original citation & hyperlink:
Brem-Wilson, J 2019, 'Legitimating global governance: Publicisation, affectedness, and the Committee on World Food Security' Third World Thematics: A TWQ Journal , vol. (In-Press), pp. (In-Press).
https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/23802014.2018.1552536

DOI 10.1080/23802014.2018.1552536
ISSN 2380-2014
ESSN 2379-9978
Publisher: Taylor and Francis

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Third World Thematics: A TWQ Journal on 08/02/19, available online: http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/23802014.2018.1552536

Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

This document is the author's post-print version, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer-review process. Some differences between the published version and this version may remain and you are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite from it.

Legitimating Global Governance: Publicisation, affectedness, and the Committee on World Food Security

Josh Brem-Wilson, Research Fellow, Centre for Agroecology, Water and Resilience, Coventry University, Ryton Gardens, Wolston Lane, COVENTRY, CV8 3LG, UK, Mob: 0044(0)7557 425448 Email: joshua.brem-wilson@coventry.ac.uk
orcid.org/0000-0003-2683-4217

Third World Thematics: A TWQ Journal
Received 20 June 2018
Accepted 22 November 2018
https://doi.org/10.1080/23802014.2018.1552536

Abstract Though global governance theorists disagree on the standard by which the legitimacy of global governance arrangements might be assessed, they do exhibit a degree of consensus on the need for more civil society participation to bridge legitimacy deficits therein. One important sub-stream of this discussion has involved assessing, therefore, the relative strengths and weaknesses of two key principles through which legitimate participants within global governance might be recognised: the 'all-affected principle' and the 'all-subjected principle'. In this paper, I shift the focus of this debate to a case study with two elements. The first involves the invocation of affectedness by civil society actors as part of their attempt to reconfigure, or 'publicise' the relationship between food system actors and global governance. The second element of the case study focusses on the principles, practices and mechanisms that have been adopted by civil society to facilitate the participation of the affected in a global governance body that is an important site for the publicisation struggle: the Committee on World Food Security. This case study reveals both what is at issue in the choice of principles of inclusion, and a methodology through which the all-affected principle can be applied.

Key words Civil society, democratization, governance, participation and power, United Nations, resistance and activism.

Introduction

The legitimacy of global governance is a topic of intense academic debate. In part this is a reaction to - and has certainly been animated by - the alter-globalisation protests of the early 2000s, one of the contributions of which was an urgent and occasionally fatal demonstration that public consent for the neoliberal agenda being promoted by IOs such as the WTO was a long way from being secured.[1] Since then scholars and theorists of global governance have conducted their own assessments of the legitimacy or otherwise of global governance, at the same time as they wrestle with the question of what, and whose, criteria ought to define that.[2]

Though suggesting that the inter-cultural composition of international politics raises questions about the convergence potential of certain normative standards (particularly those emanating from Eurocentric contexts), there does seem to be wide-spread agreement amongst global governance theorists on the need for a greater articulation between institutionalised sites of global governance, on the one hand, and wider social groupings and publics within civil society on the other. Sometimes this need is articulated as a necessary corrective to the 'democratic deficit' that befalls global governance.[3] On the question of civil society participation in global governance, however, there are different camps. For minimalists the participation of civil society is seen as something of an add-on to the inter-state system, a problem-solving fix to help bolster its legitimacy credentials.[4] Maximalists however – for example cosmopolitans and deliberative democrats working within the tradition of public sphere theory – anticipate a much more substantive role for civil society. This involves or embodies a reconfiguring of the interstate system based on new moral and normative standards that subordinate, for instance, state sovereignty to cosmopolitan legal principles or discursively produced norms emanating from public debate.[5]

Whether minimalist or maximalist, in the absence of territorially defined citizenship through which this is achieved at the state level, one important sub-stream of the debate on legitimate global governance focusses on the question of how we should recognise, and include, participants in global-level political decision-making. Two principles feature prominently in this discussion.

The first of these is the 'all-affected' principle. This is generally interpreted as meaning that all those affected by a political decision have a right to participate in its taking (or, at least, the discursive processes that are meant to be heeded by political decision-makers). Recognised as having exposed the disconnect between sites of global-level political decision-making and the wider 'people' impacted by those decisions, this principle is strongly associated with attempts to diagnose and remedy the democratic-deficit that exists in global governance. It has, however, drawn criticism along several different lines. Firstly, some allege that because affectedness implies a limitless causal chain between those who are affected and the decision by which they are affected (the 'butterfly effect'), it is impossible to apply. Secondly, and relatedly, the determination of 'affectedness' therefore implies a privileged position for experts (social scientists able to determine the precise causal relationship). And more generally, it is not at all clear what 'affectedness' even applies to. Public or private decision-making? Interests, stakes or life expectancy? For these reasons, it has been asserted that '[to] use the all-affected principle as a means to generate the appropriate boundaries of the people is not trouble free'.[6]

Faced with these difficulties, some theorists, including those such as Nancy Fraser who were at one point proponents of the all-affected principle,[7] have rallied behind an alternative principle: the *all-subjected* principle. This locates the 'morally relevant' category of inclusion as subjection 'to a given structure of governance, which sets the ground rules for their interaction'.[8] Whilst positing a condition that to its proponents seems easier to determine than affectedness, the all-subjected principle still shares with the all-affected principle the positive exercise of political decision-making as a starting position, or at least, a point of departure, for attempts to define who should count as an interlocutor within global political decision-making. This has resulted in concerns regarding the ability of this principle to secure the political standing of those who stand outside of 'regulatory jurisdictions'.[9] Fraser's response to this is intriguing: There are no such spaces. Within a 'capitalist world system' and 'interstate system' all are subjected.[10]

In this paper, I seek to contribute to ongoing debates on legitimate global governance via assessment of two different principles that are invoked to identify those entitled to participate in legitimate global politics. I shift the focus however from *theoretica*l appraisals of such principles, to a 'real-world' case study with two key aspects. The first (discussed in Part 1, 'The publicisation struggle') involves the invocation of affectedness by civil society actors as part of their attempt to reconfigure the relationship between food system actors and global governance. Reflecting the centrality to this struggle of an attempted extension of the sphere of the public, I name it a *publicisation struggle*.[11] This has three key dimensions: a) invoking issue-affectedness (as part of an attempt to) b) extend the sphere of global public governance, via c) public participation in its exercise. The second element of the case study (discussed in Part 2, 'Institutionalising issue affectedness') focusses on the principles, practices and mechanisms that have been adopted by civil society to facilitate the participation of the affected in a global governance body that is an important site for the publicisation struggle: The Committee on World Food Security (CFS). This case study reveals, to an extent that has been lost in earlier discussion, what's at stake in the choice of starting position to interrogate contestations over political space/boundary contestation. The case study also provides evidence how, in the specific case of the all-affected principle, this weakness, and other critiques levelled against it can be remedied. This is not to say that its operationalisation is without challenges, many of which, in the final instance, fall upon the shoulders of autonomous and self-organised movements of affected publics themselves.

The publicisation struggle

The idea of the 'publicisation struggle' captures the existence of an ongoing civil society effort to reconfigure political space in favour of an extended sphere of the public. Internationally dispersed, the publicisation struggle – at least as it plays out on the specific domain of *global* food and agricultural governance – centres on some key nodes. At the actor level, perhaps the most important is the global social movement La Vía Campesina. La Vía Campesina defines itself as 'an international movement bringing together millions of peasants, small and medium size farmers, landless people, rural women and youth, indigenous people, migrants and agricultural workers from around the world'.[12] The foundation of La Vía Campesina's mobilisation is food sovereignty, defined as: 'the right of peoples to healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through ecologically sound and sustainable methods, and their right to define their own food and agriculture systems.'[13]

La Vía Campesina pursues a publicisation struggle in strategic and tactical networks and alliances with other civil society organisations, both social movements and Non-Governmental

Organisations (NGOs). Some of those networks are more or less permanent, such as the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty (IPC) which articulates social movements committed to food sovereignty with UN food governance. Others are perhaps more time-limited, such as the Global Campaign for Agrarian Reform. At the institutional level, key nodes for the publicisation struggle include the CFS, and the Human Rights Council, both UN bodies.

Whilst we are unlikely to find either La Vía or their allies using the term 'publicisation' to describe their work, we can read them as pursuing this agenda based on three distinct though related actions: Firstly, invoking issue-affectedness and the constituencies that experience this. Secondly, the corresponding attempt to extend the sphere of public governance to address the issue by which they are affected. And finally, an attempt to extend public participation in the exercise of public governance.

Invoking issue-affectedness

Four examples are illustrative of the invocation of issue-affectedness, each part of an attempt to underscore the importance of an issue by virtue of its impacts upon certain key populations.

The first example is drawn from an edition of the *Nyéléni Newsletter* focusing on Biodiversity. Nyéléni was the name of what is widely regarded as a key moment in the consolidation of the international food sovereignty movement: an international multi-sectoral civil society food sovereignty gathering in Mali in 2007. The Nyéléni newsletter, established shortly after, aims both to project the voice of that movement, and provide space for exchange and information amongst its members. La Vía Campesina are one of the newsletter's participating organisations:[14]

'When commons are destroyed or privatised, *local people* lose access to important environments for foraging, gathering, grazing, hunting, fishing and regenerating biodiversity.'[15]

The second example is taken from a report published by the International Planning Committee on Food Sovereignty (IPC). As already noted, the IPC is an international network of social movements working on a food sovereignty platform, to coordinate their participation in UN food governance (predominantly, though not exclusively, the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO)). La Vía Campesina is a key member. The focus of this report is again biodiversity:

'Biodiversity is essential to *human* survival and health: when biodiversity is diminished, disequilibrium results which threatens health – both of humans and of nature.'[16]

The third example is lifted from a report published by the International Panel of Experts on Sustainable Food Systems (IPES-Food). IPES-Food is predominantly comprised of academics, some of whom, such as Raj Patel and Molly Anderson, enjoy organic links to the food sovereignty movement. It also features non-academic participation, including Pat Mooney whose ETC Group has been a long-term ally of La Vía Campesina, and, particularly relevant here, Nettie Wiebe, who is herself a key La Vía Campesina leader. This report (which cites Pat Mooney as lead-author) is entitled 'Too big to feed: Exploring the impacts of mega-mergers, consolidation and concentration of power in the agri-food sector'.[17] It seeks to draw attention to a series of ongoing and planned multi-billion dollar mergers between Agribusiness TNCs (Transnational Corporations) in various sectors. The public interest component of this issue is

affirmed via the assertion that these mergers will reinforce the industrial model of food production (of which Agribusiness TNCs are key drivers), resulting in limited options for food producers and a degraded ecological base. Corporate concentration, the report adds, shifts the locus of food system governance away from public actors and into the hands of a small number of very large corporate entities. These developments, as well as affecting our ability to address urgent issues such as climate change and biodiversity loss, represent a pressing issue for global food security:

'Dominant firms have become too big to feed *humanity* sustainably.'[18]

Crucially, this report was presented at a Side Event of the 44th Session of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) as part of a two-year attempt, spearheaded by the ETC Group, to put the issue of 'mega-mergers' on the CFS's agenda.[19] Indeed, the need for an explicit governance response is identified in the report, which identifies problematic gaps in the governance of agribusiness corporations (related to, for example, limitations in the methodology used to assess the potential impacts of large-scale mergers and acquisitions) and invokes the need for new governance mechanisms and process, including a 'UN Treaty on Competition […] required to deliver transnational oversight of mega-mergers.'[20] The attempt to extend the sphere of public governance is a crucial component of the publicisation agenda, discussed in more detail below.

The final example comes directly from La Vía Campesina: an article on their website entitled 'Affected from the world, unite!' The article profiles three activists engaged in struggles across South and North America to secure 'affected populations' access to natural resources, in the face of displacement and extreme violence following state-sponsored large-scale infrastructure projects (e.g. dams and oil pipelines). It features a quote from a Native American anti-Keystone pipeline activist, Michelle Vendiola, located in the coastal region of the North Western United States:

> The waters and the sea are a fundamental part of the [Indigenous peoples'] way of living and their means of subsistence. Most of the population is made up of fishers, who build canoes, work hard to live and feed themselves. "If the pipeline has a rupture or if there are accidents with the ships coming to receive the oil, it would contaminate the entire coast."[21]

Again, the absence of effective public governance is identified in this article as a key issue. Despite attempts to denounce dispossession, 'the state remains silent'. Indeed, it is even complicit in the violent suppression of civil society activism. Referencing the murder of anti-dam activist Nilce "Nicinha" de Souza Magalhães[22], the article states:

> This has aroused outrage and national and international rejection. It has once again seen persecution and death against those who defend territories, water and dignified life, opposing the interests of capital and states, which, instead of guaranteeing the rights of the populations affected, are accomplices of these crimes.[23]

In each of these four examples we see two things happening. Firstly, there is the positing of an issue: Degradation of biodiversity and the commons; oil contamination of water; TNC mergers. Secondly, there is the identification of a more or less boundaried population *affected* by that issue: Local peoples; Indigenous people; humanity. Given its status as a point of exchange *within* the food sovereignty movement, the first example (Biodiversity in Nyéléni) can be read as a horizontal consolidation of a shared understanding amongst movement members. The

other three examples differ in that they are located in an attempt to reconfigure the boundaries of political space by targeting and seeking to extend the sphere of public authority. In the last example, this is communicated by the thematic area of La Vía Campesina's website in which it is located: 'Campaign for a Binding Treaty'. This location illustrates that the purpose of this article is to underscore the importance of a campaign, of which La Vía Campesina is an active member, to secure a Binding Treaty on Transnational Corporations (BTTC). As with the IPES-Food initiative, this campaign positions itself as a response to a problematic gap in global governance. Discussing this in more detail takes us to our second key dimension of the publicisation agenda: Seeking to extend the sphere of public governance.

Seeking to extend public governance

Though efforts to establish 'an international system of accountability for human rights abuses committed by transnational corporations and other business enterprises' extend at least as far back as the early 1970s,[24] since 2012 new energy has been pushed into this endeavour in the form of a Global Campaign to Reclaim Peoples Sovereignty, Dismantle Corporate Power and Stop Impunity (hereafter, the 'Global Campaign).[25] Launched at the People's Summit that ran parallel to Rio+20, the Global Campaign aims to facilitate a peoples' challenge to corporate power, via **'**dialogue, strategizing, exchanging information and experiences, acting as a space for visibility of resistance and deepening of solidarity and support for struggles against TNCs'**.**[26] It counts 'over 200 social movements, networks, organisations and affected communities' amongst its signatories, including La Vía Campesina, who have been prominent in the Global Campaign since its inception (TNI, 2012b). One of the campaigns' key activities is ongoing participation in United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC) process to establish a UN Binding Treaty to regulate Transnational Corporations (BTTC). Since June 2014, the focal point for this work has been an Open Ended Intergovernmental Working Group (OEIGWG) in the UNHRC,[27] whose meetings have been attended by La Vía Campesina and other civil society members within the Global Campaign.

As noted above, La Vía frame their participation in the BTTC process with reference to Indigenous peoples' and other communities' affectedness by potential degradation of the ecological base of their food system. This is a consequence of corporate activities, and violent suppression of their resistance to these developments. The absence of effective political authority is highlighted as a key part of this problematic, with the state being either 'silent' or complicit. The problematic of the absence of effective political authority and governance takes prominence in the framing of the Global Campaign,[28] and in Global Campaign communications to the Human Rights Council. For example, in written evidence to the first meeting of the OEIGWG in June 2014, the Global Campaign framed the problematic like this:

> [N]o mechanisms exist in parallel [to FTAs, WTO] at the international level to deal with [TNC's] human rights violations and to ensure access to justice for the victims of their activities. In the absence of binding agreements at the international level, impunity typically prevails, especially when victims are in the Global South.[29]

A new binding global governance instrument, therefore:

> … must establish the obligation of TNCs to respect all international and national provisions and laws that prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, colour, gender, religion, political opinion, nationality, social origin, social status, belonging to an indigenous or Afro-descendant people, disability, and age, among others.[30]

It must, in other words, close the gap.

Here, then, we find the second of three moves through which La Vía and their allies pursue a publicisation agenda: via the attempt to extend the sphere of global governance, specifically international public law.[31] This is an attempt to reconfigure political space, to subject TNCs whose present freedoms allow them 'to escape any control', to a 'legally binding instrument' that obligates them to adhere to international and national legal frameworks.

In relation to this attempt, the invocation of issue-affectedness, discussed above, is part of a chain of normative reasoning that couples the experiences of affected populations, on the one hand, with a problematisation of gaps in public governance - and the actors who exploit those gaps - and a corresponding attempt to address that gap, on the other. In the autumn 2017 session of the OEIGWG, a representative from La Vía Campesina invoked issue-affectedness thusly:

> I want to take this opportunity to share some of the struggles of affected people from Europe. […] Across Europe foreign direct investment is affecting our access to housing, imposing energy extraction or generation that pollutes our environment and resources.[32]

The resonant image of a social movement activist (in this case, a female member of the UK La Vía member organisation, the Land Worker's Alliance) taking the floor at the intergovernmental meeting of a UN body, takes us to the final dimension of the publicisation struggle: The attempt to expand public participation in the exercise of public (global) governance.

Securing public participation in global governance

So far in this article I've made reference to a global social movement (La Vía Campesina), an international civil society network committed to food sovereignty (IPC), an electronically accessible multilingual newsletter produced by and addressed to members of the international food sovereignty movement (Nyéléni Newsletter), and have quoted material accessed from the websites of all the above, as well as that of IPES-food, the Global Campaign to Reclaim Peoples Sovereignty, Dismantle Corporate Power and Stop Impunity, and others. Collectively, this represents a new participatory, or communication *infrastructure*,[33] much of it impelled by the commitment of its participants to food sovereignty's assertion of 'the right of peoples to healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through ecologically sound and sustainable methods, and their right to define their own food and agriculture systems'.[34]

This infrastructure, which is underpinned by a perpetual stream of WhatsApp, skype, email and social media communication between its participants (or key groupings thereof), finds it outpourings in periodic international assemblies or gatherings, such as the 2007 Nyéléni Forum for Food Sovereignty, in Mali;[35] the 2009 People's Food Sovereignty Forum, Rome, Italy; the 2016 European Forum for Food Sovereignty (Nyéléni Europe), Cluj, Romania; the 2018 assembly of the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty in Cape Town, South Africa;[36] La Vía Campesina's 5 yearly international assemblies[37], and, the Annual Forum of the Civil Society Mechanism that autonomously facilitates civil society participation in the UN Committee on World Food Security.[38] Crucially, though not exclusively, much of this infrastructure is stamped with a policy or governance orientation, meaning that it seeks to 'bridge the gap'[39] between affected populations and sites of global governance. We have seen this in the first instance by the discursive articulation of a chain of normative reasoning that couples the experiences of affected populations, on the one hand, with demands and aspirations

for global governance on the other. This communication infrastructure provides a platform for the circulation and consolidation of this thinking. However, crucially it also provides a platform to *enable the direct participation of affected populations* in global governance processes.[40]

Part One: Summary

The idea of the 'publicisation struggle' captures the existence of an ongoing civil society effort to reconfigure political space in favour of an extended sphere of the public. To put it differently, it is an attempt to transform both the *quantity* and *quality* of public governance. Quantitatively, it seeks to close down the freedom of movement of agribusiness corporations, subordinating them to, and therefore extending, the obligations of international public law. Qualitatively, it seeks to attain a substantive form of public governance by better integrating (global) public governance on the one hand, and affected publics on the other. Recalling the above, it does this in two ways.

Firstly, at the level of normative discourse. Underscoring the importance of an issue via the delineation of a population that are affected by it, acquires normative resonance precisely because the context in which this is pursued (UN intergovernmental policy-making) is positioned in an uneasy tension between its status as formally public though suffering substantive publicity deficits. This speaks to the fact that actual publics are more or less completely absent from global governance processes. Indeed, UN officials are themselves aware of this disconnect, and this is part of the reason why movements like La Vía Campesina have standing in such contexts, because 'they actually represent somebody'.[41] Thus, invoking issue-affectedness as part of an attempt to extend the sphere of public authority can be read as seeking to affirm, or even reanimate, the norm that (global) public authority should be responsive to those who are affected by it. And as it does so, intentionally or otherwise, it invites upon those claiming (or having projected upon them) the status of 'affected populations', the assignation of (proto) *affected publics*.

The other way the publicisation seeks to bridge the gap between publics/ affected populations and global governance is at the level of participation, via the creation of a communications and participation infrastructure, which functions as a platform for direct participation in global governance processes. If in the first instance, such upwardly mobilising networks invite the assignation 'affected publics' by virtue of the contexts into which they project (i.e., via their aspiration to become agents in global governance) and attenuation of the substantive publicity deficits that are endemic therein, their autonomous and bottom-up character also gives them a public status that is completely independent of public authority. That is, as a 'self-organised discourse public'[42] or, invoking something of a relationship to public authority, a 'subaltern counterpublic'.[43]

At this mid-way point, it's worth relating the insights captured above to the discussion on legitimacy presented in the introduction, an important sub-stream of which focused upon the question of how we recognise who should count as a participant in global politics. It will be recalled that this discussion pivoted on the assessment of two different principles: the all-affected principle, and the all-subjected principle. Three concerns were levelled at the former: That its causal ambiguity makes it very difficult to apply; its application assigns a privileged status to experts; and more generally the concept suffers from a somewhat fatal lack of specificity. In light of these difficulties some analysts have proposed the all-subjected principle as an alternate and superior principle of inclusion. Recalling the above, three points can be made.

Firstly, whilst both the all-subjected and all-affected principle take as their point of departure the positive exercise of political authority (deriving either affectedness or subjection therefrom), this overlooks the extent to which, from the perspective of those pursuing the publicisation agenda, it is precisely the absence of effective political authority that is at issue.[44] That is, it would overlook the extent to which contestation of the boundary of the political is a key part of the publicisation agenda, something that *is* captured by the shift to issue-affectedness. Indeed, publicisation contests the boundary of the political in at least two regards: In relation to the question of who counts as an interlocutor *within* democratic politics, but also who or what counts as an object *of* democratic politics. In relation to the question of whether affectedness pertains to private or public matters, the publicisation agenda's attempts to convert both private vulnerabilities and entitlements into objects of public governance communicate that – at least within the model of politics being evoked here - it is not possible *a priori* to determine whether affectedness should refer to issues emanating from the public or private sphere. A principle of inclusion therefore that takes as its starting position the positive exercise of political authority would suppress all these elements, overlooking the extent to which the boundary of global public authority is itself at issue. Both the all-subjected principle, and the all-affected principle – as commonly defined – suffer from this shortcoming.

At the same time, the shift from decision-affectedness to issue-affectedness neutralises the so-called 'butterfly effect' that in the eyes of some critics at least is fatal to the all-affected principle's application. This is because it posits both a measure of affectedness (issue-affectedness) and a process for determining that (dialogue) that at least imply a verifiable boundary.[45] The existence of a normative discourse of issue-affectedness, circulating between and emanating from self-organised discourse publics, moreover, indicates that the determination of affectedness is *not* exclusively in the hands of technocratic or political elites. It can be established dialogically, in processes involving affected-publics themselves.[46]

Since its reform in 2009 the United Nations Committee on World Food Security has been at the cutting edge of attempts to secure the participation of affected publics in processes of global level policy-making and governance. Along the way, various principles, practices and mechanisms have been developed to achieve this goal. Shifting the focus to this body, therefore, gives further evidence of the applicability of the all-affected principle. It also, however, reveals the conditions – and effort – that are required to achieve this. In so doing, it imparts an embodied quality into this debate. It also reveals that, in the final analysis, the burden for securing the participation of affected publics falls to the autonomously organised social movements such as La Vía Campesina, who ultimately are the bridge between global level policy spaces such as the CFS, and grassroots communities of the affected.

Institutionalising issue-affectedness: The United Nations Committee on World Food Security

The United Nations Committee on World Food Security (hereafter CFS) defines itself as the 'central United Nations political platform' for food security coordination.[47] Though the history of civil society engagement in the CFS stretches back to its founding in 1974, it is only really since 2009 that it has provided a prominent space for the promotion of the publicisation agenda.[48] This is a consequence of its reform in the same year, following the 2007-2008 'food price crisis', after which it was endowed with a number of important features. These include a role as a site of global level food security policy convergence, and – whilst still retaining its intergovernmental character – an extension of formal rights to participate in its work to five categories of non-state actor. Crucially, these include 'civil society', with emphasis given in

the CFS's reform document to the need to pay 'particular attention' to the participation of a number of key constituencies, discussed below.[49]

The attainment of a formal participation right by civil society in the reformed CFS was neither accident nor good fortune, and in fact was one of many victories secured by civil society actors themselves, following the opening up to them of the reform process by its managers. [50] The reform blueprint adopted in 2009 that was the outcome of this process recognised the right of civil society to autonomously manage their own participation. At its 2010 annual plenary the CFS 'acknowledged' the proposal[51], formulated by a core group of civil society organisations that had been working closely together since the reform process, for an 'International Food Security and Nutrition Civil Society Mechanism for Relations with CFS' by which they would undertake this.[52] Since then the Civil Society Mechanism (hereafter, CSM) has facilitated civil society participation in the work of the CFS on 1000s of occasions, channelling substantive civil society input into more than 20 policy processes. Along the way, building upon and refining its organisational structure as defined in 2010, it has developed a sophisticated framework of principles and practices to help it to achieve its primary function to 'facilitate civil society participation and articulation into the policy processes of the CFS'.[53] In the remainder of this section I'll provide an overview of the some of these, paying particular attention to: a) How the CSM qualifies 'issue-affectedness'; b) the role of facilitation in the CSM; and c) the central role assigned to self-organised social movements in securing the CSM's inclusivity aspirations.[54]

Qualifying issue-affectedness

In the CSM 'affectedness' is an absolutely fundamental organisational principle. Its founding document makes reference to the 'affected' 11 times across 16 pages. The following quote is illustrative:

> The CSM will be an inclusive space open to all civil society organizations: it will involve the full range of constituencies concerned about and *affected by* hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition, including social movements and NGOs, particularly those from developing countries, *those affected by hunger* and those committed to the realization of the right to food and food sovereignty.[55]

As evidenced, the definition of affectedness that prevails within the CSM is *issue-affectedness.* In its founding document, either clustered or separately, this is qualified to include being affected by: *hunger* (mentioned 6 times)*; food insecurity* (mentioned 5 times); *malnutrition* (mentioned twice)*;* and *marginalization* (mentioned once).[56] As is also made clear, the purpose of the CSM is not just to involve 'affected constituencies', but to *prioritise* their participation.[57] To help it to achieve this objective, in accordance with the approach civil society advocated during the reform process, and which is captured in the CFS's own reform blueprint, 11 constituencies are identified as participating actors in the CSM: Smallholder family farmers, artisanal fisherfolk, herders/pastoralists, landless, urban poor, agricultural and food workers, women, youth, consumers, Indigenous Peoples, and NGOs.[58] The rationale for this approach – which was imported from the IPC network whose actors played a fundamental role in the CFS reform process, and whose properties and experiences provided a template for the design of the CSM itself[59] – is not made explicit in the CSM's founding document, but it is implied. Underscoring the importance of three constituencies in particular, this document states:

Particular priority will be given to peasant and indigenous food producers and workers affected by hunger and marginalization because they represent a large majority of the hungry people in the world and produce the largest proportion of the food in the world.[60]

The constituency approach aims, in other words, to secure the participation of these specific constituencies, because they are the ones most affected by the issue of food insecurity. However, as is alluded to here and made explicit elsewhere, they also have a key role to play in remedying food insecurity: '[V]ictims of hunger are also the bearers of solutions'.[61]

In pursuit of its goal to prioritise their participation in the CFS, the CSM seeks to weigh participatory opportunities in favour of affected constituencies relative to another sub-group within civil society: NGOs. This is evident in the fact that of the 11 constituencies of civil society differentiated in the CFS's reform blueprint, 10 are of the former. Given that NGOs are the dominant civil society presence in global governance,[62] this can be read as a non-neutral intervention to facilitate political space for affected constituencies in a context where historically this has been lacking.[63] A closer look at the role of 'facilitation' in the CSM takes this point further.

Facilitating Political Space

As noted, the CSM seeks to facilitate the participation of affected constituencies in the work of the CFS. To achieve this, it sets out to prioritise the participation of 10 constituencies of the affected. Specifically, this means that when NGOs participate in the CSM, they do so predominantly (though not exclusively) in the role of *facilitation.*[64] This has several dimensions.

Firstly, it involves providing a range of different types of support to social movement actors seeking to participate in the CFS, from coordinating civil society input into CFS work streams, to helping prepare briefings or interpretative guides on the use of CFS outputs, to providing strategic advice, and more. A recurring motif used by the facilitators themselves to describe this work is 'translation'. This involves translating the language and aspirations of social movements into a UN-compatible format, and then translating the UN context (and its outcomes) for the movements. Secondly, facilitation requires a special sensitivity to the participatory barriers that are faced by movements seeking to mobilise affected constituencies into global policy spaces. These include a lack of time, variable online access, as well as general difficulties trying to understand the complexity of a UN policy space, its protocols, and institutional context. NGOs – though a heterogeneous community – participating via professional full-time staffers with accumulated experience in the institutional context, are not so constrained. Thus, in the first instance, for an NGO staff person assigned to facilitate civil society input into a CFS policy process, the first task is to mediate between the silence of social movements, and a potential flurry of inputs coming from NGOs. This requires active outreach to harder-to-reach social movement actors: initiating telephone calls and skypes; monitoring calendars to identify when key people could be visiting Rome (the home of the FAO, the CFS's host institution) and therefore available for face-to-face meetings; and more.

And finally, for an NGO, participating in the CSM as a facilitator means accepting a diminished profile for your work. Working collaboratively - and somewhat obscurely - out of the public gaze in a facilitation role means that there are no reports, or campaign achievements, or side events, that can be shared with NGOs headquarters, members, funders or wider publics, to communicate and explain the NGO's work. Publicity, though, is crucial to NGOs functioning.[65] Hence even when an organisation is committed to the facilitation role being performed by one

or more of their staff people in the CSM, the individual concerned can be caught in a tension between, on the one hand, the demands of facilitation, and on the other, the demands of their organization for measurable outputs that can be used to promote its work.

For NGOs therefore, who participate in the CSM (particularly over the medium and long-term), the demands are significant. The willingness to meet these is often underpinned by deep personal and political commitments of individuals taking on facilitation roles, and, of particular relevance to the sustainability of these commitments, by organisational mandates. But NGOs are not the only ones being tested by the facilitation demands of the CSM. Social movements are too. CSM governance is undertaken by a Coordination Committee (CC) comprising 24 members from the constituencies and an additional 16 from sub-regions. At least half of the CC are women. The CC is the central node in the CSM organisational structure. Its members provide political leadership in the working groups that are formed to coordinate civil society input into CFS policy processes, and it takes the CSM's key political decisions. Its members are also tasked, however, with facilitating their constituency's involvement in the CSM work. One consequence of this is that the social movement or individual in the coordination role may find herself having to work with movements – from the same territory or wider afield – with whom her organisation or movement may be ongoing ideological-, value- or interest-based disagreements and even conflicts. Such conflicts and disagreements, however, have to be set aside in order to properly fulfil the facilitation role. Another way of putting this is to say that if to pursue a CSM facilitation role NGOs have to surrender their *profile*, movements have to surrender the *purity* of their struggle. Needless to say: understanding the process, providing ongoing updates to organisation and constituency members on the ground, collaborating with non-allies, is not easy:

'The real work is so hard, it was so hard and it is so hard.'[66]

In an online survey conducted as part of the 2018 evaluation of the CSM, in response to the question 'Were the views of social movements prioritised in [the work of the CSM]?' over two thirds of participants answered positively, with the majority of the remainder saying they were unsure.[67] This is arguably testimony to the success of the facilitators in operationalising the CSM's commitment to ensuring the participation of affected constituencies in its work.[68] This facilitation has a dual character: securing political space, and mitigating the barriers that otherwise would hinder these constituencies' participation in the demanding arena of global governance. However, if it is the case that facilitators (both social movement and others) in the CSM have succeeded in creating an enabling environment for the participation of affected constituencies, this directs our attention to other locations where the participation of the affected can be secured or not. One of these is within the CSM's participating organisations themselves.

Carrying the burden of inclusion

In a 2015 clarification to the CSM's internal guidelines, an important qualification was added to the CSM's constituency approach. Constituencies, it was stated 'are global in nature'. This meant that, correspondingly:

> In a constituency, *the main global movement* should play a key role in participation and facilitation of the constituency and facilitate the participation of the other international, continental, regional social movements and organizations that are made up of persons from this constituency. When the constituency is not well covered by a single global

movement, that constituency will include international, continental, regional organizations, and the most representative organizations should facilitate that constituency.[69]

This clarification was to a large extent a response to ongoing tension within the CSM between different groupings, the traces of which were clearly visible in a minority position communicated in response to this amendment, and posted on the CSM's website.[70] Whatever the merits or otherwise of this approach, it assigns a fundamentally important part of the responsibility for facilitating the participation of affected constituencies to autonomously organised, global social movements of affected constituencies such as La Vía Campesina. This has two dimensions. On the one hand, facilitating the other 'international, continental, regional social movements and organizations that are made up of persons from this constituency.' And on the other, 'facilitating the constituency'. Crucially, this depends in part on the capacity of the movement itself to provide a participatory infrastructure between affected constituencies and a global policy body like the CFS. To be sure, such an approach is consistent with the normative criteria for a legitimate, inclusive deliberative polity, which assigns 'a good part of the normative expectations connected with deliberative politics on the peripheral networks of opinion-formation'.[71] And to their allies in the CSM, La Vía Campesina are celebrated for their capacity 'to transform local struggle into a political struggle', to really bring 'the political dimension of the struggle of the smallholders into the CFS and into the political processes'.[72] However, at the same time, movement insiders are aware of, and prioritise the addressing of, regional 'bottlenecks', suggesting challenges doing this, as I discuss below, as universally as the all-affected principle might require.[73]

In the CSM, despite the centrality of this idea to its operations, there is no definition of 'facilitation'. Here though I have attempted to illuminate two dimensions: Facilitation of political space, and the facilitation of participation within that. Indeed, if the publicisation struggle is essentially concerned with reconfiguring political space, the CSM can be regarded as a key mechanism for attempting to advance that struggle, and articulating it with an actual site of institutionalised governance. Or, in the parlance of public sphere theory, articulating 'weak' and 'strong' publics.[74] Privileging and facilitating the participation of affected constituencies, with a corresponding reconfiguration in the space and role of NGOs are political choices. Indeed, the CSM's political profile is alluded to in its internal guidelines,[75] and widely acknowledged ~~by some at least of~~ amongst those performing facilitation roles in its work.

As this overview of the CSM indicates, facilitation is where the commitment to enabling the participation of the affected is made tangible. Along with issue-affectedness, which is then translated into a constituency approach, it is part of a methodology for applying the all-affected principle. However, in the last instance, the burden for securing the participation of the affected, falls to the autonomously organised social movements providing a participatory infrastructure to the affected themselves. For facilitators in the CSM, that this *is* happening, has to be assumed.[76] In recognising this point, I am definitely not suggesting that movements such as La Vía Campesina should be subject to external monitoring to determine the extent to which they are meeting this aspiration. In a context where institutional actors – whose responsiveness or not to affected constituencies determines the true 'political' significance of their participation – are generally completely untroubled by and unresponsive to the legitimacy deficits inherent within their own lack of substantive publicity, it would be completely inappropriate to impose this upon affected constituencies. I simply acknowledge it, in order to make the point that when we shift from abstract discussion to empirical case study, the questions that we need to ask become clarified. In this instance, the pertinent one is not 'Can the all-affected principle be applied?', but 'To what extent can autonomously organised social

movements mobilising the affected into global policy processes such as the CFS be supported to achieve their inclusivity aspirations?'

Conclusion

The starting point for this article is ongoing assessment of two principles for recognising who should count as a legitimate interlocutor in global governance, in the context of wider concerns about its legitimacy deficits. In providing an overview of the publicisation agenda, I have illustrated both what is at issue in the starting position for defining criteria of inclusion, and the applicability of the all-affected principle, via participation rights based on issue-affectedness, discursive publics, and an organisational methodology with facilitation at its core. This last component comprising both facilitation of (political) space, and facilitation of participation within that space.

In providing evidence for the applicability of the all-affected principle I am addressing a concern with what may be called *route viability*. This speaks to the question of how practical various theoretical projects for securing the legitimacy of global governance are. In this regard, the approach offered here stands in contrast to the dubious wisdom embodied in, for example, cosmopolitan approaches. Specifically, I'm referring to a tendency to locate the seeds of a more expansive and inclusive global politics in elite projects such as liberal internationalism, which whilst perhaps in content anticipate such politics, in composition - being constituted by global policy elites - are impossibly far away. In contrast, the approach outlined here has a crucial bottom-up, non-elite character, pivoting on the autonomous agency of affected publics themselves. This is not to say, as I have suggested, that this is without challenges. One such important challenge being the standard of legitimacy that it invokes. As is perhaps apparent, the advocates of the publicisation agenda have *their own standards* for legitimate global governance.[77] These depend for their attainment to a great extent upon the responsiveness of global public authority to their concerns. This requires a degree of normative agreement on such thorny issues as, for example, the place of TNCs in global policy processes – something that advocates of the publicisation agenda are seeking to problematise, and policy elites for the main part seeking to promote.[78] Thus the realisation of the type of legitimate politics embodied in the publicisation agenda hinges on a shift in mindset of global elites that whilst not utopian, will not either be easily won.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my continued gratitude to the affected publics and facilitators whose ongoing labours are a source of inspiration for my work. I would also like to thank Coventry University for a Pump Prime research grant (13613-13) that enabled the research for this paper. And finally, I would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for their very useful thoughts and suggestions.

Bibliography

ActionAid International, the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty and Oxfam. "Proposal for an International Food Security and Nutrition Civil Society Mechanism for Relations with CFS." 2010.
http://www.csm4cfs.org/the-csm/

Arnold, D. “Transnational Corporations and the Duty to Respect Basic Human Rights.” *Business Ethics Quarterly* 20, no.3 (2010): 371-399.

Brassett, J. and Tsingou, E. (2011). “The politics of legitimate global governance.” *Review of International Political Economy* 18, no.1 (2011): 1-16.

Borras Jr., Saturnino, and Jennifer C. Franco. “Transnational Agrarian Movements struggling for land and citizenship rights.” *IDS Working Paper, 323. 2009*. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.

Brem-Wilson, J. ‘La Vía Campesina and the UN Committee on World Food Security: a transnational public sphere?’ PhD diss., University of Bradford, 2012.

Brem-Wilson, J. “Towards Food Sovereignty: Interrogating Peasant Voice in the UN Committee on World Food Security.” *Journal of Peasant Studies,* 42, no.1 (2015): 73-95.

Brem-Wilson, J. “Boundary contestation in global food governance: Reflections from CFS43.” Guest contribution to *Food Governance: Blog of Dr Jessica Duncan* (2016). https://foodgovernance.com/2016/11/07/boundary-contestation-in-global-food-governance-reflections-from-cfs43/.

Brem-Wilson, J. “La Vía Campesina and the UN Committee on World Food Security: Affected Publics and Institutional Dynamics in the Nascent Transnational Public Sphere.”, *Review of International Studies*, 43, no. 2 (2017): 1-28. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210516000309.

Brennan, B. “States make historic call for UN to implement binding regulations on Transnational Corporations.” TNI Website, 18 Sep 2013. https://www.tni.org/en/article/historic-call-ecuador.

CFS (Committee on World Food Security). “Reform of the Committee on World Security: Final version.” 2009.
http://www.fao.org/unfao/bodies/cfs/cfs35/index_ en.htm.

CFS (Committee on World Food Security). “Final Report, Thirty-Sixth Session, Rome, 11-14 and 16 October 2010.”
http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/020/k9551e.pdf

CSM (Civil Society Mechanism for relations to the UN Committee on World Food Security). “CSM Guidelines on Internal Functioning: On Transparency, Accountability, Inclusiveness, Selection and Decision Making Processes in the CSM.” CSM Website. (2015).
http://www.csm4cfs.org/the-csm/.

CSM (Civil Society Mechanism for relations to the UN Committee on World Food Security). “What is the CSM.” CSM Website.
Accessed May 14, 2018.
http://www.csm4cfs.org/the-csm/.

CSM (Civil Society Mechanism for relations to the UN Committee on World Food Security). “The CSM Forum,”
Accessed May 18, 2018.

http://www.csm4cfs.org/the-csm/.

Desmarais, A. *La Vía Campesina: Globalization and the power of peasants*. London: Pluto Press, 2007.

Duncan, J. *Global Food Security Governance: Civil Society Engagement in the Reformed Committee on World Food Security*. London: Routledge, 2015.

ECVC (European Coordination Vía Campesina). "Wealthy states in this room must take responsibility: Lynne Davis during Binding Treaty negotiations." *Web Site: European Coordination La Vía Campesina*, 27 October 2017.
http://www.eurovia.org/wealthy-states-in-this-room-must-take-responsibility-lynne-davis-during-binding-treaty-negotiations/.

Front Line Defenders. "Case History: Nilce De Souza Magalhães." *Front Line Defenders Website.* Accessed May 8, 2018.
https://www.frontlinedefenders.org/en/case/Case-History-Nilce-de-Souza-Magalhaes

Fraser, N. "Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy." *Social Text* 25/26 (1990): 56–80.

Fraser, Nancy. "Publicity, Subjection, Critique", Nash, K. ed. *Transnationalizing the Public Sphere: Nancy Fraser et al.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 2014.

Fraser, N. "Special section: Transnational public sphere: Transnationalizing the public sphere: On the legitimacy and efficacy of public opinion in a post-westphalian World." *Theory Culture & Society* 24, no. 7 (2007): 7–30. DOI: 10.1177/0263276407080090

Fraser, N. *Scales of Justice: Reimagining Political Space in a Globalizing World.* Cambridge, UK: Polity, 2008.

Gaarde, I. *Peasants Negotiating a Global Policy Space: La Vía Campesina in the Committee on World Food Security.* Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Global Campaign (Global Campaign to Dismantle Corporate Power and Stop Impunity). "Written contribution of the *Global Campaign to Dismantle Corporate Power and Stop Impunity* to the first session of the intergovernmental working [group] mandated with the elaboration of an international legally binding instrument on transnational corporations (TNCs) and other business enterprises with respect to human rights, June 2015." Dismantle Corporate Power: Website of the Global Campaign to Reclaim Peoples Sovereignty, Dismantle Corporate Power and Stop Impunity.
http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/HRCouncil/WGTransCorp/Session1/Global_Campaign_to_Dismantle_Corporate_Power_andStop_Impunity_June-2015_en.pdf.

Global Campaign (Global Campaign to Dismantle Corporate Power and Stop Impunity). "Call to International Action For the Economic, Political, Cultural and Environmental Sovereignty of Our Peoples End the Impunity of Transnational Corporations Now!" Dismantle Corporate Power: Website of the Global Campaign to Reclaim Peoples Sovereignty, Dismantle Corporate Power and Stop Impunity.
Accessed November 11, 2017.

https://www.stopcorporateimpunity.org/call-to-international-action/

Global Campaign (Global Campaign to Reclaim Peoples Sovereignty, Dismantle Corporate Power and Stop Impunity). "Why is the Global Campaign Mobilized Towards A UN Binding Treaty for Transnational Corporations on Human Rights?" Dismantle Corporate Power: Website of the Global Campaign to Reclaim Peoples Sovereignty, Dismantle Corporate Power and Stop Impunity.
Accessed May 9, 2018.
https://www.stopcorporateimpunity.org/binding-treaty-un-process/.

The Guardian. "15 ways NGOs can attract positive media attention, 3rd March 2015."
https://www.theguardian.com/global-development-professionals-network/2015/mar/03/ngos-positive-media-attention-communications-pr.

Habermas, J. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere, trans. Thomas Burger.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989.

Habermas, J. *Between Facts and Norms, trans. William Rehg*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996.

Held, D. "Law of States, Law of Peoples: Three Models of Sovereignty." *Legal Theory* 8, no. 2 (2002).

Held, D. (2006). "Reframing global governance: Apocalypse soon or reform!" *New Political Economy*, 11, no.2 (2006): 157–176. https://doi.org/10.4000/rsa.514.

Heri, C. "Self-Representation and the Rise of Peasant Human Rights." Sändig et al. (eds.) *Third World Thematics*, Unpublished paper.

Higgot, R. and E. Erman. "Deliberative global governance and the question of legitimacy: what can we learn from the WTO?", *Review of International Studies* 36, no. 2 (2010): 449-470.

Human Rights Council. "Twenty-sixth session, Resolution adopted by the Human Rights Council 26/9 Elaboration of an international legally binding instrument on transnational corporations and other business enterprises with respect to human rights, 14 July 2014." https://www.ihrb.org/pdf/G1408252.pdf.

IPC (International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty). "Peasants Give Life to Biodiversity."
www.foodsovereignty.org/wp-content/.../IPC-Agricultural-Biodiversity-Brochure.pdf

IPC (International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty). "Statement by the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty (IPC) from Paarl (Cape Town), March 2018."
https://viacampesina.org/en/the-ipc-statement-from-paarl-cape-town/.

IPES-Food (International Panel of Experts on Sustainable Food Systems). "Too big to feed: Exploring the impacts of mega-mergers, concentration, concentration of power in the agrifood sector." 2017.
www.ipes-food.org

IPES-Food (International Panel of Experts on Sustainable Food Systems). “IPES-Food: a new expert panel guided by new ways of thinking about research, sustainability, and food systems.” Accessed November 9, 2017.
http://www.ipes-food.org/.

Keohane, R. O. “Global governance and legitimacy.” *Review of International Political Economy* 18, *no.*1 (2011): 99–109. https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290.2011.545222.

La Vía Campesina. “The international peasant’s voice: Globalizing hope, globalizing the struggle!” La Vía Campesina Website.
Accessed May 18, 2018.
https://viacampesina.org/en/international-peasants-voice/.

La Vía Campesina. “What is La Vía Campesina?” La Vía Campesina Website.
Accessed November 17, 2013.
http://viacampesina.org/en/index.php/organisation-mainmenu-44/what-is-la-via-campesinamainmenu-45.

La Vía Campesina, “International Conferences,”
Accessed May, 18, 2018.

McKeon, N. *The United Nations and civil society: Legitimating global governance – whose voice?* London: Zed Books, 2009.

McKeon, N. *Food Security Governance: Empowering Communities, Regulating Corporations*. London: Routledge, 2015.

McKeon, N. “Are Equity and Sustainability a Likely Outcome When Foxes and Chickens Share the Same Coop? Critiquing the Concept of Multistakeholder Governance of Food Security.” *Globalizations*, 14, no. 3 (2017): 379-398.

Näsström, S. “The Challenge of the All-Affected Principle.” *Political Studies*, 59 (2011): 116-134. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9248.2010.00845.x

The New York Times. “Farming is Korean’s Life and He Ends It In Despair.” 16 September 2003, https://www.nytimes.com/2003/09/16/world/farming-is-korean-s-life-and-he-ends-it-in-despair.html

Nyéléni 2007 – Forum for Food Sovereignty, “Nyéléni 2007 – Forum for Food Sovereignty,” 2007a.
https://nyeleni.org/spip.php?rubrique2 Accessed 18.5.18

Nyéléni 2007 – Forum for Food Sovereignty. “Declaration of Nyéléni,” 2007b.
https://nyeleni.org/spip.php?article290.

Nyéléni Newsletter. “Why are the Commons important for Food Sovereignty?” *Nyéléni Newsletter, 24, December 2015*.
https://nyeleni.org/spip.php?page=NWrub.en&id_rubrique=165.

Nyéléni Newsletter. “About Us.”

Accessed May 8, 2018.
https://www.nyeleni.org/spip.php?page=NWarticle.en&id_article=372.

Owen, D. "Dilemmas of Inclusion: The All-Affected Principle, the All-Subjected Principle, and Transnational Public Spheres." Nash, K. ed. *Transnationalizing the Public Sphere: Nancy Fraser et al.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 2014.

Schramm, A. & Sändig, J. "Bridging Global Divides: Affectedness Alliances in Global Agriculture Governance," *Third World Thematics (2019). doi: 10.1080/23802014.2018.1575767.*

Scholte, J. A. "Towards greater legitimacy in global governance." *Review of International Political Economy* 18, no.1 (2011): 110-120. https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290.2011.545215

TNI (Transnational Institute). "Peoples Summit Rio +20, 15 June 2012." TNI Website,

TNI (Transnational Institute). "Global campaign to challenge the power of corporations launched in Rio+20, 19 June 2012." TNI Website.
https://www.tni.org/en/pressrelease/global-campaign-challenge-power-corporations-launched-rio20}.

TNI (Transnational Institute). "8 Proposals for the Binding Treaty on Transnational Corporations and Human Rights, 20th July 2015." TNI Website.
https://www.tni.org/en/publication/8-proposals-for-the-binding-treaty-on- transnational-corporations-and-human-rights.

Treaty Alliance. "History." Website of the Global Movement for a Binding Treaty.
Accessed May 9, 2018.
http://treatymovement.com/.

Tujan, T. Zuayter, R. Andela, C. AlAmleh, J.T Akrout, K. Malari, S.Halim, U., Kenyangi, G.K., Rengam, S.V. "An Open Letter to the Civil Society Mechanism (CSM) on Internal Functioning of the CSM."
Accessed May 13, 2018.
http://www.csm4cfs.org/the-csm/.

Viviana Rojas/La Vía Campesina. "Affected from the world, unite! 23 October 2017." La Vía Campesina Website.
https://viacampesina.org/en/affected-world-unite/.

Warner, M. "Publics and Counterpublics." *Public Culture* 14, no. 1 (2002): 49-90. https://muse.jhu.edu/article/26277.

Weiss, T. G., Conor Seyle, D., and Coolidge, K. "The Rise of Non-State Actors in Global Governance: Opportunities and Limitations." *One Earth Discussion Paper*, 2013. https://acuns.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/gg-weiss.pdf.

Young, I. M. "Responsibility and Global Justice: A Social Connection Model." *Social Philosophy and Policy,* 23, no.1 (2006): 102-130.

Zanella, M. A., Goetz , A., Rist, S., Schmidt, O. and Weigelt, J. "Deliberation in Multi-Stakeholder Participation: A Heuristic Framework Applied to the Committee on World Food Security." *Sustainability, 10,* no. 2 (2018), https://doi.org/10.3390/su10020428.

Notes

[1] The New York Times, "Farming is Korean's Life."
[2] Brasset and Tsingou, "Legitimate global governance"; Scholte, "Towards greater legitimacy"; Keohane, "Global governance and legitimacy"; Higgot and Erman, "Deliberative global governance"; Held, "Law of states"; Held, "Reframing global governance"; Fraser, "Transnationalising the public sphere."
[3] Scholte, "Towards greater legitimacy."
[4] Higgot and Erman, "Deliberative global governance."
[5] Held, "Law of states"; Held, "Reframing global governance"; Fraser, "Transnationalising the public sphere"; Fraser, "Publicity, Subjection, Critique."
[6] Näsström, "All-affected principle," 124.
[7] See Fraser, "Transnationalising the public sphere".
[8] Fraser, "Publicity, Subjection, Critique," 168.
[9] Owen, 'Dilemmas of Inclusion."
[10] Fraser, "Publicity, Subjection, Critique" 153.
[11] The idea of the publicisation struggle builds on and develops earlier analysis of the engagement of food sovereignty social movements in the CFS from the perspective of public sphere theory. See: Brem-Wilson, *La Vía and UN*; Brem-Wilson "Affected Publics Institutional Dynamics"; and McKeon, *Food Security Governance, 262-263.*
[12] La Vía Campesina, "International peasant's voice."
[13] Nyéléni 2007 – Forum for Food Sovereignty, "Declaration of Nyéléni."
[14] Nyéléni Newsletter, "About Us."
[15] Nyéléni Newsletter, "Commons for Food Sovereignty," (emphasis added).
[16] IPC, "Peasants Life to Biodiversity," (emphasis added).
[17] IPES-Food, "New Expert Panel."
[18] IPES-Food, "Too big to feed," 5 (emphasis added).
[19] The author was present at both attempts.
[20] IPES-Food, "Too big to feed," 11.
[21] Rojas/La Vía Campesina, "Affected unite!"
[22] 'Nilce "Nicinha" de Souza Magalhães was one of the leaders of the Movement of People Affected by Dams (Movimento dos Atingidos por Barragens - MAB), a social movement founded in the 1970s that sought to advocate for the rights of people affected by the construction of dams. Nilce de Souza Magalhães was active in denouncing human rights violations perpetrated by the consortium Sustainable Energy of Brazil (Energia Sustentável do Brasil - ESBR) in the construction of the Usina Hidrelétrica (UHE) in Jirau, Porto Velho.' Front Line Defenders, "Nilce De Souza Magalhães."
[23] Rojas/La Vía Campesina, "Affected unite!"
[24] Treaty Alliance, "History."
[25] TNI, "Global campaign launched."
[26] Global Campaign, "Why the Global Campaign?"
[27] 'Human Rights Council, "Instrument On Transnational Corporations."
[28] Global Campaign, "Call to International Action."
[29] Global Campaign, "Contribution to Working Group," 2.
[30] Global Campaign, "Contribution to Working Group," 3.
[31] See also in this Special Edition: Heri, "Rise of Peasant Rights."

[32] ECVC, "Wealth states responsibility."
[33] Borras Jr. and Franco, 'Transnational Agrarian Movements,' 38. Brem-Wilson, "Affected Publics, Institutional Dynamics."
[34] La Vía Campesina, "La Vía Campesina?" (emphasis added).
[35] Nyéléni 2007 – Forum for Food Sovereignty, "Forum for Food Sovereignty."
[36] IPC (International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty), "Statement from Paarl."
[37] La Vía Campesina, "International Conferences."
[38] CSM, "The CSM Forum."
[39] McKeon, *UN and Civil Society*, 90.
[40] Duncan, *Global Food Security Governance*; Gaarde, *Peasants Negotiating Global Policy;* McKeon, *Food Security Governance.*
[41] Interview, Senior UN Official, 2009.
[42] Warner, "Publics and Counterpublics."
[43] Fraser, "Rethinking the public sphere."
[44] As also captured by Heri in this Special Edition: Heri, "Rise of Peasant Rights."
[45] For example, the appeal made by the Indigenous activist that oil contamination of the Pacific North-West will affect the communities dependent upon its waters, can in principle be more or less concretely verified or refuted, with reference to such information as the scale of potential pipeline ruptures; their typical effects upon marine or coastal life; and the range of Indigenous peoples' potential livelihood activities affected by this.
[46] Something that Fraser acknowledges in the case of the all-subjected principle, but not, perhaps inconsistently given her commitment to public rationality, for the all-affected principle. See: Fraser, *Scales of justice,* 70.
[47] CFS, "Reform of the Committee," 1.
[48] Duncan, *Global Food Security Governance*; Gaarde, *Peasants Negotiating Global Policy;* McKeon, *Food Security Governance.* Brem-Wilson, "Affected Publics Institutional Dynamics."
[49] CFS, "Reform of the Committee," 4.
[50] Brem-Wilson, "Towards Food Sovereignty," 7.
[51] The principle that civil society were autonomously responsible for their own participation meant that CFS wasn't being asked to 'authorise' this proposal.
[52] CFS, "Final Report 2010."
[53] CSM, "What is the CSM."
[54] This section is predominantly informed by 11 in-depth interviews conducted between Feb-May 2018 focusing on the activities and experiences of actors performing key facilitation roles in the CSM.
[55] Action-Aid, IPC and Oxfam International, "Civil Society Mechanism Proposal," 2 (emphasis added).
[56] Ibid.
[57] Ibid., 7.
[58] Ibid., 4.
[59] Interview, CSM Facilitator, March 15, 2018.
[60] Action-Aid, IPC and Oxfam International, "Civil Society Mechanism Proposal," 3.
[61] Ibid., 3.
[62] Weiss, Conor Seyle and Coolidge, "Non-State Actors," 4.
[63] As captured in previous studies examining the specific history of La Vía Campesina, and the more general history of the food sovereignty movement's engagement with the UN. Desmarais, *La Vía Campesina*; McKeon, *UN and Civil Society*.

[64] For additional perspective on facilitation dynamics in the CFS see, also: Schramm & Sändig, "Bridging Global Divides" (in this issue); Gaarde, *Peasants Negotiating Global Policy*; and Brem-Wilson, "Affected publics institutional dynamics."
[65] The Guardian, "NGOs media attention."
[66] Interview, Social movement participant and facilitator in the CSM, April 16, 2018.
[67] The author assisted with the design, building and administration of the survey.
[68] This is not to suggest that the challenge of securing the effective participation of social movement actors and affected constituencies has been resolved. As of yet, no one has systematically analysed the extent to which all affected constituencies that wish to, or have attempted to, have been able to participate effectively in the CFS. There is general recognition amongst CSM facilitators, however, that the learning curve is very steep, and long, and that significant barriers still exist.
[69] CSM, "Guidelines on Internal Functioning", 4 (emphasis added).
[70] Tujan et al., "Letter on Internal Functioning."
[71] Habermas, "Between Facts and Norms," 358.
[72] Interview, CSM Facilitator, March 13, 2018.
[73] Interview, La Vía Campesina staff person, November 9, 2015.
[74] Fraser, 'Rethinking the public sphere' 74-77.
[75] For example, the CSM's Guidelines on Internal Functioning state that whilst inclusivity is an important CSM value, when considering which social movements and organisations to give priority to, attention should be paid to the political weighting of participating movements. This is underscored in the same document by the assertion that "all constituencies and sub-regions should ensure that its CC members come from social movements with an irrefutable record in the struggle for their rights'. "Guidelines on Internal Functioning", 4.
[76] Interview, CSM Facilitator, February 2, 2018.
[77] Which converge, however, with those of public sphere theory. See: Brem-Wilson, "Affected publics institutional dynamics.' McKeon, *Food Security Governance*, *262-263.*
[78] Relatedly, another key issue that I have not had the space to discuss is the impact of the multi-stakeholder character of the CFS for the attainment of the publicisation agenda. For some initial thoughts on this see Brem-Wilson, "Boundary Contestation", and additional valuable contributions from Zanella et al., "Multi-Stakeholder Participation"; and McKeon, "Equity and Sustainability".